

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CROMAN CORPORATION, an Oregon)	2:05-cv-0575-GEB-JFM
corporation,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	<u>ORDER</u>
)	
v.)	
)	
GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY, a New)	
York corporation; SIKORSKY AIRCRAFT))	
CORPORATION, a Delaware)	
corporation; HELICOPTER)	
SUPPORT, INC., a Connecticut)	
corporation; UNITED TECHNOLOGIES)	
CORPORATION, a Delaware)	
corporation; and ROTAIR)	
INDUSTRIES, INC., a Connecticut)	
corporation,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

On January 30, 2006, the parties filed a stipulation and proposed order seeking to reset the trial date in this action. The Rule 16 Scheduling Order ("Scheduling Order") filed August 1, 2005, set trial to commence on March 20, 2007. (Scheduling Order at 8.) The Scheduling Order also reminded the parties that "pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b), the [Scheduling Order] shall not be modified except by leave of Court upon a showing of good cause." (Id.) The parties' stipulation to modify the Scheduling

1 Order, which was entered over six months ago, does not constitute
2 "good cause." As the parties were cautioned in the Scheduling Order,
3 "a mere stipulation by itself to change [a] date[] [in the Scheduling
4 Order] does not constitute good cause." (Id. at 9.) Therefore, the
5 trial commencement date will remain as set.

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: February 3, 2006

8 /s/ Garland E. Burrell, Jr.
9 GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR.
10 United States District Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28